

## REMARKS

The Examiner's recognition of Applicants' invention by the allowance of claim 9 and the indication of allowable subject matter for claims 4-8 is gratefully acknowledged.

The specification is amended to clarify nomenclature for drive member 12, driven member 16, cams 26, and bolts 20 that attach posts 32. The description makes clear that the member 12 drives member 16, but confusingly refers to member 12 as the driven member (i.e., driven by the engine) and member 16 as the drive member (i.e., driving the compressor). Despite the preferred use, within the context of the torque limiter, it is believed clearer to refer to drive member 12 and driven member 16. The drive-driven nomenclature does not change the function of the members as described and depicted, and so does not add new matter to the case. Also, the specification is amended to clarify that elements 26 (originally referred to as cam followers) are cams as that term is readily understood to mean an off-center wheel, and should not be confused with element 20 that attaches post 32. The amendment avoids confusion by pointing to the cam elements significant in the operation of Applicants' invention, making explicit that which is clearly shown, and does not add new matter to the case.

In response to an objection, paragraph 0014 is amended to clarify that driven member 16 is within the drive member 12, as shown in Fig. 1 and discussed herein.

The claims are amended to clarify the drive member, the driven member and the cams consistent with the amended nomenclature in the specification. Claim 1 is amended to call out posts 32 that extend axially from the drive member, see Fig. 1 and paragraph

16, and more particularly point out that cams 26 are pivotally attached to spring arms 22, see Fig. 1 and paragraph 15.

*Objections to Specification and Claims*

Objections were made to wording in the specification and claims regarding the drive and driven members. It is believed that the amendments herein clarify that drive member 12 is disposed about driven member 16.

In view of the amendment, it is requested that the objections be withdrawn.

*Claims Rejection based upon Kawaguchi et al.*

Claims 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,234,904, issued to Kawaguchi et al. in 2001.

Kawaguchi et al. describes a pulley assembly 18 for transmitting power from a rotor element 41 to a drive shaft 16 of a compressor, see Fig. 2 and col. 7, beginning at line 47. Rotor 41 carries engaging elements 42 that include recesses 43, col. 7, lines 65-67, and col. 8, lines 5-6. Spiral springs 47 are connected to drive shaft 16 and include outer ends 47a that are received in recesses 43 to transmit the torque, col. 8, lines 55-67. When the load torque exceeds the desired limit, outer ends 47a slide radially out from recesses 43 to disengage the rotor and the shaft, col. 10, beginning at line 19. In contrast, Applicants' assembly comprises cams 26 pivotally attached to spring arms 22 and

engaging posts 32 on the drive element. The spring ends in Kawaguchi et al. slide out of recesses, and nothing in Kawaguchi et al. shows cams that pivot to release the spring arms from posts. Therefore, Kawaguchi et al. does not anticipate or even suggest Applicants' assembly.

Claim 1 is directed to Applicants' transmission and torque limiting assembly that comprises a mechanism for transmitting rotation from a drive member to a driven member. The mechanism includes posts axially extending from the drive member, and spring arms extending from the driven member. The mechanism further includes cams pivotally attached to the distal ends of the spring arms and engaging the posts. Kawaguchi et al. does not show cams on the springs arms, or posts on the drive member. Thus, Kawaguchi et al. does not teach or suggest Applicants' assembly in claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims based upon Kawaguchi et al. be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that the claims be allowed.

*Claims Rejection based upon Hawkins et al.*

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by United States Patent No. 3,724,815, issued to Hawkins et al. in 1973.

Hawkins et al. shows an overload protection mechanism for a hand wheel. Referring to Fig. 1, the hand wheel includes a rim portion 12 comprising recesses 44. A

hub portion 14 is connected to the rim portion by overload devices 50, col. 3, lines 1-5. Devices 50 include rollers 58 that are biased by linear springs 62 into recesses 44 to transmit torque from the rim to the hub, col. 3, lines 14-20. In response to an excessive load, the rollers roll out of the recesses, col. 3, lines 58-67. In contrast to the rollers in Hawkins et al., Applicants' mechanism comprises cams on spiral spring arms and engaging posts on the drive member. Hawkins et al. provides linear coil springs, as opposed to spiral arms. Moreover, Hawkins points to rollers that roll out of recesses, and does not contemplate cams to pivot eccentrically to disengage from posts. Thus, Hawkins et al. does not teach or suggest Applicants' assembly.

Claim 1 calls for a mechanism that includes posts axially extending from a drive member, and cams pivotally attached to spring arms extending from a driven member. Hawkins et al. shows rollers that roll out from recesses, and does not show cams engaging posts. Thus, Hawkins et al. does not teach or suggest Applicants' assembly in claim 1, or in claim 3 dependent thereon.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims based upon Hawkins et al. be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that the claims be allowed.

*Conclusion*

Claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 were objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim. In view of the amendments and remarks herein, it is believed that the base claim is now allowable. Accordingly, it is requested that the objection be withdrawn, and that these claims be allowed, along with allowed claim 9.

If it would further prosecution of the application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the phone number provided.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 50-0831.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Douglas D. Fekete", written over a horizontal line.

Douglas D. Fekete

Reg. No. 29,065

Delphi Technologies, Inc.

Legal Staff – M/C 480-410-202

P.O. Box 5052

Troy, Michigan 48007-5052

(248) 813-1210